

APPROVED

CRAIG PAEPRER
Chairman

ANTHONY GIANNICO
Vice Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS

KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE
ROBERT FRENKEL
MARK PORCELLI
VICTORIA CAUSA

TOWN OF CARMEL **PLANNING BOARD**



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190
www.ci.carmelny.ny.us

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Code
Enforcement*

RICHARD FRANZETTI, P.E.
Town Engineer

PATRICK CLEARY
AICP, CEP, PP, LEED AP
Town Planner

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **NOVEMBER 12, 2020**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, CRAIG PAEPRER, VICE CHAIRMAN, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
KIM KUGLER, RAYMOND COTE, ROBERT FRENKEL, VICTORIA CAUSA

ABSENT: MARK PORCELLI

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Old Forge Estates	75.15-1-19-40	P.H.	1-4	Public Hearing Closed.
Itzla Subdivision	55.14-1-6	P.H.	4	Public Hearing Closed.
14 Nicole Way LLC (Zakon)	65.6-1-22	P.H.	4-5	Public Hearing Closed.
Carmel Fire Department	44.14-1-24	Resolution	5-6	Resolutions Adopted.
Stillwater Business Park	75.17-1-53 86.5-1-25,26	Site Plan	6-9	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Rudovic Bridal Shop	55.6-1-12	Site Plan	9	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Mahoven LLC (Kaneti)	75.42-1-13	Special Site Plan	10-11	Denied to the ZBA & Referred to ECB.
Downtown Mahopac Properties	75.12-2-26	Extension	11-12	1 Year Extension Granted.
Gateway Summit Senior Housing – Lot 6	55.-2-24.6-1 55.-2-24.6-2	Re-Approval	12-13	1 Year Re-Approval Granted.
The Fairways Senior Housing – Lot 7	55.-2-24.8-1 55.-2-24.8-2	Re-Approval	13-14	1 Year Re-Approval Granted.
The Hamlet at Carmel	66.-2-58	Extension	14-15	1 Year Extension Granted.
Minutes – 09/16/20 & 10/21/20			15	Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

OLD FORGE ESTATES – BALDWIN PLACE ROAD – TM – 75.15-1-19-40 – PUBLIC HEARING

The consultants had no comments.

Chairman Paeprer asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Mr. Matthew Bennett a resident of Rolling Greens approached the podium and stated he biggest concern is the sewage treatment, which consists of three fields, and two fields will be alternated during the day and every year one field will be taken out of service. It sounds like it will work initially, but 20 years from now, who knows if it will work. Who will be maintaining it? If it's a homeowners association, I've never know a homeowners association being particularly successful at taking care of anything and this is very important. He said this has been endemic to the Town of Carmel. We always try to do a little more than our geography will allow us to do and down the road someone is really sorry that it happened. He stated I get the impression that this is another one of these cases. He said I think this is a worrisome thing.

Mr. Franzetti stated Mr. Bennett and I spoke earlier this week. The review and the approval for the sewer are typically left up to the Putnam County Department of Health and they have reviewed this system. He said there are community systems in the area, for example Random Ridge on Kennicut Hill Road. He said instead of each home having an individual sub-surface septic system, there's a community one that captures and treats the sewage from there. It has been reviewed and approval by the Department of Health.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated there are three systems, three sets of fields. The fields are designed for 14 units times 4 bedrooms times 150 gallon per day per bedroom. He said the percolation test and the deep test were all witnessed by the NYCDEP and the Putnam County Health Department. Based on the percolation rate, there is basically 3,000 to 4,000 feet of fields per system. It's not a small system for individual residents; it's a lot more linear footage of fields. There is a pump station and monthly recordings would have to take place to verify the usage. He said the homeowners association will own it and maintain. They are required to enter into a contract with the maintenance company. He said you will always have one additional pump on site, because it is a duplex pump system. As part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, you get your yearly and bi-yearly inspections.

Mr. Frenkel asked what is the power source for the pumps and what is the backup for that?

Mr. Lynch replied they are electric and there will be a generator on site that's sized to handle the pumps.

Mr. Bruce Schwartz of 28 Muscoot Road North approached the podium and stated my property backs right on this project. I have lived there for almost 40 years. He asked if a traffic study has been done for the project. He said 14 houses relates to about 28 extra cars a day on Baldwin Place Road plus service vehicles. How will that affect the traffic which is terrible right now? He asked will that road be used to bring all the construction vehicles in also, or do you have a plan to bring the construction vehicles in from a different area.

Mr. Lynch replied a traffic study has not been done specifically for this project. Based on the counts that the Putnam County Highways and Facilities had in the previous

application, they did not have an issue with the additional traffic that's going to be generated by the project. He said the construction equipment will go in one time. There will be a construction entrance built in between the two pillars on Baldwin Place Road. The equipment will stay on site from that point in time. He said with this clustered subdivision, the rear property lines that would butt up to the homes on Muscote Road North, there will be a 100 foot strip land that will be forever green. It becomes part of the open space requirement.

Mr. Schwartz asked again was there ever a traffic study done on any of the previous proposals and how it will impact Baldwin Place Road with the High School and Middle School traffic. He then requested to have a traffic study done to see how it will impact the neighborhoods. Mr. Schwartz continued and asked about the grade of the road going into the development.

Mr. Franzetti stated the town code allows up to 15% grade.

Mr. Schwartz asked what is the grade on that road?

Mr. Lynch replied the first 400 feet will be 12% and then after that it's 10% and then it flattens out to about 1½%.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the water main that comes up over the hill that they want to hook into.....

Mr. Lynch stated the owners of this property installed the water main that crosses their land.

Mr. Schwartz replied many years ago.

Mr. Lynch stated in 2006, somewhere in that range and that was all part of their original approval.

Mr. Schwartz stated wasn't that main also put in there to help the people in Rolling Greens who have water situations and they tied into it.

Mr. Lynch replied that's correct. He said you are all part of the same water district.

Mr. Schwartz asked how do you know if there is enough water to supply your new 14 houses and plus all the houses in Rolling Greens that are supposed to hook up this without the people in the back of Rolling Greens. He said I know the water comes from the lake, but the pumping station should have some sort of capacity to handle all that. Has any survey been done to find out how many people are actually hooked up to the system in Rolling Greens?

Mr. Franzetti stated no survey has been done. He said I was not the Town Engineer at that time, but I believe when it was designed it was designed with the fact that this particular development with 10 houses was included with it along with all the homes that would be connected. I think some homeowners had an option not to connect if they still had water. He said if you're in the district, you're paying capital charges, so you have the option to buy into it. I believe this property is in the water district and has been paying capital charges similar to those people who are in your district who have not connected.

Mr. Schwartz stated from what I understand if you sell your house, you can't sell unless you hook up to it.

Mr. Franzetti said the town does not have that requirement. If a house has a well, it has a well. He said when someone wants to connect into the district, we make sure that the well is disconnected and there is an air gap between the well and the water district, so there is no cross contamination.

Mr. Schwartz stated with all that said, is there enough capacity to handle everybody.

Mr. Franzetti stated my understanding is when all this was designed and put together; it was designed to include 10 houses plus what was all of Rolling Greens.

Mr. Schwartz stated that was then, have things changed over the years.

Mr. Franzetti replied yes, they actually use low flow flushes. They use about 110 gallons per day per bedroom.

Mr. Schwartz stated so you're saying that there is enough capacity.

Mr. Franzetti replied that is my understanding, the one it was originally designed yes. He said and we're planning on putting in some larger pumps.

Mr. Schwartz asked does this need ECB approval?

Mr. Lynch replied yes. He said this access road is in the same location as the previous approval and previously it has received ECB approval. He said we are making a new submission to be presented to the ECB.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the forever green acres. He asked where does it guarantee that no one can build or can the homeowners put in baseball fields, etc.

Mr. Carnazza stated it will be a condition of approval and filed with the map.

Chairman Paeprer asked if anyone else would like to be heard on this application.

Chairman Paeprer asked Mr. Cleary if he knew the calculations regarding traffic flow with 14 additional homes.

Mr. Cleary stated this is roughly 1.8 peak hour trips per dwelling unit. That's morning and afternoon during the peak hours. He stated with the original approval Putnam County had input with respect to whether or not it would rise to the level of requiring a traffic impact analysis based on the intersections. At the time, the indication was it would not. He said this application has 4 additional units. I don't think 4 additional would change that, but we could revisit it and confirm it once again.

Chairman Paeprer stated I think it might be a good idea to revisit it. I don't want to slow the process down at all, but I think we could do this in parallel.

Mr. Cleary stated we are at the preliminary approval stage for this project. This isn't final approval.

Chairman Paeprer asked Mr. Cleary to look into the traffic study.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Chairman Paeprer asked the Planner to prepare the preliminary subdivision resolution.

ITZLA SUBDIVISION – 9 MECHANIC ST. – TM – 55.14-1-6 – 2 LOT SUBDIVISION

The consultants had no comments.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant stated this is a simple two lot subdivision. The applicant is subdividing his 1½ acre parcel and making it into two lots.

Chairman Paeprer stated we received a letter of support from one of the neighbors. He then asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Cote moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

14 NICOLE WAY LLC – (ZAKON) – 14 NICOLE WAY – TM – 75.42-1-13 – PUBLIC HEARING

The consultants had no comments.

Chairman Paeprer asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this application.

Mr. Bill Silkowski of 21 Nicole Way approached the podium and stated my house is up on a hill and at this time of the year you could see through the trees right down to Route 6. He said he would like to see a row of evergreen trees behind the property, so I'm not looking at propane trucks and propane storage tanks.

Mr. Joe Zakon addressed the board and stated we left all of the trees behind us to keep the natural buffer, so we don't have to put in extra stuff that I would have to keep alive and maintained. He said Mr. Silkowski is asking for a row of trees along the back to block this area here (points to map) where the trucks and tank would be. He said I'm willing to put a fence up to the height of the foundation which is 11 feet. I would go to 10 feet and put the vinyl privacy slats in it to block the view.

Mr. Carnazza asked can you make them green slats to blend in with everything.

Mr. Zakon replied yes.

Mr. Silkowski stated I would really like to see trees if possible.

At which time, a discussion ensued with regards to either adding trees or a 10 foot fence with the vinyl slats in the rear of the property.

Mrs. Causa agreed with Mr. Silkowski. She said a fence line is not enough. Putting trees that do not require a lot of maintenance would be much better. She said it is still part of a residential area, even though you are on a main road.

Mr. Al Cappelli, the applicant's architect addressed the board and stated the trees that are going in should Mr. Zakon agree to it, aren't going to be monster trees. They are going to be standard 6 to 8 foot trees. To get to the heights of the buffer, it's going to take quite a bit of time.

Mr. Silkowski stated Hemlock trees grow to 20 feet high. I don't expect them to put 20 foot trees in now. He said I've been there 30 years and it's a beautiful area and I want to keep it that way.

Mr. Frenkel stated it's a good compromise, putting in moderate size trees that would eventually grow over time.

Mr. Carnazza asked the board members how many trees and the exact location for the trees.

Vice Chairman Giannico stated the section to the right of the building.

Mr. Cleary stated what you have done in the past is grant a conditional approval subject to the submission of a landscaping plan that your consultants would review and approve.

The board members were in agreement with Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Zakon said I understand what you're saying, but the argument that I have, is if the trees do not survive and die, because they are on the plan, I would have to replace them year after year.

Chairman Paeprer stated as Mr. Cleary recommended, they will look at the landscaping plan, and if they come back and say the area is all rock and ledge, we will go to plan B.

Mr. Zakon said and plan B would be to put in the vinyl fence with the privacy slats.

Chairman Paeprer replied yes, that's correct. At which time, he asked if anyone else wished to be heard on this application.

Hearing no further comments from the audience, Vice Chairman Giannico moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

Chairman Paeprer asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

**CARMEL FIRE DEPARTMENT – 94 GLENEIDA AVE – TM – 44.14-1-24 – AMENDED
SITE PLAN – RESOLUTION**

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti had no comments.

Mr. Cleary stated you have two resolutions before you to be voted on tonight.

Mr. Cote moved to adopt Resolution #20-10, dated November 12, 2020; Tax Map #44.14-1-24 entitled Carmel Fire Department Final Amended Site Plan Approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adopt Resolution #20-09, dated November 12, 2020; Tax Map #44.14-1-24 entitled Carmel Fire Department SEQR Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

STILLWATER BUSINESS PARK – 105 STILLWATER ROAD – TM – 75.17-1-53, 86.5-1-25,26 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicants propose to merge the three commercial lots, remove the existing house (Pre-Existing, Non-Conforming two-family) and small garage, legalize the existing rear storage building, relocate a storage building that was built without approvals, and add the large storage building all to bring the site into conformity. A variance was granted by the ZBA for the rear storage building and is noted on the plat. Provide the location of the existing tree buffer. Additional buffer may be needed as there is a residential area across the street. Could it be extended and improved by the scale? As requested by the neighbors, the westerly access is now entrance only. This is helpful as it will minimize the headlights glaring into the houses across the street. This project should be referred to the ECB for comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated:

1. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - a. Putnam County Department of Health
 - b. Mahopac Fire Department
 - c. Town of Carmel Highway

Applicant has noted these referrals.

2. Permits from the following would appear necessary:
 - a. Town of Carmel Highway Driveway permit
 - b. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) – Coverage under General Permit GP-0-20-001

Applicant has noted these permits.

- c. New York City Department of Environmental Protection per the Watershed Rules and Regulations, permits are required within limiting distance to reservoirs and reservoir stems and selective clearing along right of way.
3. The area of disturbance for the work has been provided as 1.8 acres. The threshold criteria of disturbances for the NYSDEC stormwater regulation are between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre and over one (1) acre. The project will require coverage under the NYSEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-20-001) and the development of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that has permanent controls.

Applicant has noted this comment. A SWPPP has been provided and is under review.

4. Traffic and Vehicle Movement Plans should be provided which provide the following:

- a. Sight distances and proposed clearing at each driveway have been specified on the plan.

All calculations should be provided.

- b. Slopes at the entrance way need to be defined. It is suggested that slopes of less than 6% be used for the first 20 feet of entry and that slopes of no greater than 8% be used entering the site.

Applicant noted comment

Provide a profile of the driveways.

Applicant will provide in a future submission.

5. All existing and proposed easements on the site must be provided.

Applicant has noted this comment and provided the easement information. This should be reviewed by counsel.

6. The applicant may be required to supply a stormwater maintenance agreement and maintenance guarantee per Town Code (§156-85 and §156-87 B respectively).

Applicant has noted this comment.

7. Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part of the development of the tract, a Performance Bond and associated Engineering Fee must eventually be established for the work.

Applicant has noted this comment.

I. Detailed Comments

1. Layout and Landscape Plan Sheet SP-1

- a. All plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.
- b. All planting should be verified by the Town of Carmel Wetlands Inspector

2. Grading and Utilities Plan Sheet SP-2

- a. Top and bottom wall elevations have been provided for the proposed retaining wall.

Applicant has provided this information. The wall at highest point is 6.7' tall. All wall calculations must be certified by a structural engineer. A safety fence may need to be installed on the top of the wall

- b. Drainage system profiles must be provided.

Applicant will provide in a future submission.

3. Erosion and Sediment Control Sheet SP-3

- a. This minimally includes the depth to groundwater in the area where the unit is installed.

Applicant has noted these comments and will provide a SWPPP that addresses these comments. The SWPPP is currently under review.

4. Details Sheets D-1, D-2 and D-3

- a. All plantings shall be installed per §142 of the Town of Carmel Town Code.
- b. All planting should be verified by the Town of Carmel Wetlands Inspector.

Mr. Cleary stated this applicant has been quite responsive to your comments and Insite Engineering has been very good at documenting the evolution of the plan. There are two issues the board should take into consideration. The buffer has been expanded and thickened and you should make a determination as to whether or not that's satisfactory. The other issue related to the architecture of the building and how that would relate to the Liffy Van Lines building next door. You should comment and determine if that's a satisfactory architectural approach to the building. He said this is an industrial site and the Liffy Van Lines building is very well maintained.

Mr. Cote asked if they had any renderings of the building.

Mr. Adam Thyberg of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we do not have renderings, but we have elevations. At which time, Mr. Thyberg displayed the elevations of the building to the board. He stated the layout of the building has been modified slightly, which was in response to better accommodating the needs of the applicant and to find some efficiency in the earth work that's going to be required in order to set this on the site. He said the overall concept of the building has not changed, nor has the total square footage.

Chairman Paeprer stated most of us are familiar with the existing building that's there. Can you describe the materials and appearance of the proposed building compared to the existing building?

Mr. Thyberg stated the proposed building will be very similar to the existing building. It will be a metal building, with beige and red trim color scheme. It's going to have the same industrial and clean look like the other building.

Chairman Paeprer stated he has been to the site several times. I'm personally in favor of more buffer rather than less buffer. He asked about the landscaping plan.

Mr. Carnazza stated the landscape plan is on the site plan, it shows additional trees up front. But, it's up to the board to decide if that's enough or would like more trees.

Chairman Paeprer stated I would like to see more landscaping near the house.

Mr. Carnazza stated that's where they are making one way in only. Which is what we asked for.

Mr. Thyberg stated with regards to the evergreen screen in particular, we made much denser than it was in the previous plan. He said we increased the evergreen trees about 50% more than the previous plan.

Chairman Paeprer stated he would like to see a rendering of the landscaping as we move forward. Also, we would to see a rendering from the street level.

The board members were in agreement with the Chairman.

Vice Chairman Paeprer asked what types of trees are proposed?

Mr. Thyberg stated spruce trees are proposed.

Mr. Cote moved to schedule a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

RUDOVIC BRIDAL SHOP – 1707 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.6-1-12 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza stated the necessary variances were granted by the ZBA and they are noted on the plat. He asked is there room for a garbage truck to pick up the dumpster? It looks close.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated no site improvements are proposed for this project. This Department does not have any additional comments related to this project as long as there are no changes being made to the site.

a. The following referrals would appear to be warranted – Carmel Fire Department

Applicant has noted comment and forwarded site plant the CVFD.

Mr. Cleary stated all planning issues have been addressed.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant pointed to the map showing the location of the dumpster. He said it is a one way traffic pattern so that the refuse truck could pull in. He said there's no turning around and there is plenty of room, because there is no backing up at all.

Mr. Franzetti asked if anything from NYCDEP was required for the main street area.

Mr. Greenberg replied we received a letter from NYCDEP stating a SWPPP was not required for this project.

Mr. Greenberg asked when you schedule a public hearing; if possible, can the resolution be drafted also.

Chairman Paeprer said he was fine with the drafting of the resolution.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to schedule a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Chairman Paeprer asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

**MAHOVEN LLC (KANETI) – 737 SOUTH LAKE BLVD – TM – 75.42-1-13 –
SPECIAL SITE PLAN**

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant propose to add a bathhouse (raised deck removed), extend dock to 25' long (width-from property line to property line) and pergola to an existing vacant lot on South Lake Blvd. in Mahopac. To my knowledge, the State DOT has not approved the driveway that was added prior to the owner purchasing this lot. Check the site distance as the walls on the adjacent lots block the view when pulling out onto South Lake Blvd (State Rt. 6N). This project needs to be referred to the ECB for comments.

Several variances are required from the ZBA.

Lot area	3000 s,f,	961 s.f.	2039 s,f, variance
Lake Frontage	50 ft	15 ft	35 ft
Side Yd. Bathhouse	15 ft	2 ft and 4 ft	13ft and 11 ft
Side Yd Pergola	20 ft	0 ft and 4 ft	20 ft and 16ft
Rear Yd	20 ft	12 ft.	8 ft
PARKING	2 spaces	1 space	1 space

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated this application encompasses adding to existing dock, adding a pergola and storage building. The amenity will require the creation of parking on the site per §156.27 of the Town Code. Based upon our review of this submittal, the Engineering Department (Department) offers the following preliminary comments:

1. The applicant provided a Town of Carmel Flood Plain permit application.
 - a. This will need to be signed by the applicant once approved by planning board.
 - b. There is information missing on the application (i.e., FEMA map panel number).
 - c. Approvals from Planning Board and ECB will be needed.
 - d. A report or the drawings need to provide the information required as part of this application (i.e. elevations as related to flood plain)
2. The following referrals would appear to be warranted:
 - The Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board
 - New York State Department of Transportation
3. Additional details should be provided regarding:
 - How the proposed features will be installed (construction sequence)
 - The plan must show the location of erosion and sediment control measures being used during construction.
 - The project is located on Lake Mahopac, wetlands and associated buffer zone must be delineated and provided on the drawings.
 - The plans should specify the total area to be disturbed, as well as the extent of new impervious areas to be created, so that applicable SWPPP requirements can be defined.

Applicant has noted that these details will be provided once the site layout is approved by the Planning Board
4. Various plan information required pursuant to §156-27 ("Site Plans") is currently lacking. These include, but are not limited to:
 - Lakefront is to be 50 feet, however only 15 feet is provided.

Mr. Cleary stated the primary revision has been the elimination of the deck on top of the building. He said they have been making revisions based on your comments. The pergola is now built into the fence.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we have made several changes to the plan. We moved the pergola, so the post for the pergola becomes part of the post for the fence. He said we have responded to all the memos from the NYSDOT, but we haven't received any approvals yet. He said we also eliminated the deck on the top of the building. We just have a roof that slopes and all the drainage will go into a rain garden. At which time, Mr. Greenberg continued to discuss the pergola, bathhouse and rain garden.

Mr. Cote asked about the distance from the edge of the road to the front of the shed.

Mr. Greenberg displayed the drawing showing the distance from the road. He said from the edge of the road to the bathhouse is about 26½ feet.

Mr. Cote asked what is it from the edge of the property to the bathhouse.

Mr. Greenberg replied 19½ feet.

Mr. Frenkel moved to deny the application to the ZBA. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Causa with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to refer the application to the ECB. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Giannico with all in favor.

DOWNTOWN MAHOPAC PROPERTIES – 559 ROUTE 6 – 75.12-2-6 – EXTENSION OF FINAL AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated we received approval to build a building about a year ago. We received the approval subject to NYSDOT. We have submitted a revised drawing back in June; he sent a comment letter back, which I disagreed with. We have emailed the NYSDOT, called the office numerous times to no avail. He stated the Planning Board office also sent an email with no response back.

Mr. Charbonneau suggested if Mr. Greenberg writes a letter to Mr. Bentley and states that he is writing this letter at the direction of the Chairman of the Planning Board, because we would like to get resolution to this that would probably be the next step. The next alternative would be for either you or I to contact him directly.

Mr. Franzetti asked Mr. Greenberg what were the comments that you didn't agree with the DOT. From my understanding the DOT wanted to have all the new curbs and handicapped spots put in. Is that correct?

Mr. Greenberg stated originally we had all our drainage going into one catch basin on Route 6. They also wanted a complete study of all Route 6 and down to the lake.

Mr. Franzetti stated so you have now put in sub-surface infiltration. He said the curbing is not in the best of conditions. It wouldn't be a bad thing to make the site better and maybe to have the curbing and sidewalks put in correctly. Chairman Paeprer stated if the DOT is saying you need to do this, maybe he's not responding because you're not agreeing to do this.

Mr. Greenberg stated we did respond with an alternative and they went back to the same thing, new sidewalks, new curbing, new everything. He stated we compromised on a couple of things.

Chairman Paeprer stated to make sure there is full disclosure before writing to the NYSDOT. He said this is a very important piece of property, we want to do everything right.

Mr. Cote moved to grant an extension of amended site plan for 1 year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frenkel with all in favor.

GATEWAY SUMMIT SENIOR HOUSING – LOT 6 – GATEWAY DRIVE – TM- 55.-2-24.6-1, 6-2 – EXTENSION OF FINAL AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the the Engineering Department has no objection to re-granting the Site Plan Approval for this project as there are no changes to the site being made. The following should be noted:

Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH) Requirements

- The PCDOH approved the wastewater collection system plans and they are valid until October 23, 2022.

New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Requirements

- The NYCDEP approved the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for this project on August 21, 2007.
- The NYCDEP provided a conditional extension to the August 21, 2007 SWPPP on October 29, 2012.
- The conditions of the SWPPP are now set to expire on August 28, 2022.
- The NYCDEP approved an extension of the design approval on May 13, 2010. The permit is set to expire on October 30, 2024.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Requirements

- The NYSDEC approved an extension wetlands permit is set to expire on September 9, 2025.
- The NYSDEC granted a stormwater permit on June 18, 2007. According to the NYSDEC website, this permit is still in effect.
- The NYSDEC updated the General Stormwater Permit in 2015 (GP-0-15-002)
- Per the NYSDEC if a project was approved under an earlier version of the General Stormwater permit and is being built under an updated version of a General Stormwater permit, the applicant does not need to meet the updated technical criteria, only ministerial criteria.

Mr. Cleary stated there have been no changes and no objections. They has been extended and re-approved numerous times.

Ms. Dawn McKenzie of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this is part of the G & F Subdivision which was originally approved in 2007. She stated this application is for 150 senior housing units. There are two different types of units, which are cottages (attached single family homes) and multi-family buildings. She said there is a trail system that connects to The Fairways Senior Housing.

Chairman Paerprer asked when and/or if the project will get off the ground.

Ms. McKenzie stated in this current economic climate, financial institutions are reluctant to finance projects such as this. They are being very cautious. She said the applicant has kept up with all his approvals and wants to move forward with the project, but now is not the right time.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adopt Resolution #20-11, dated November 12, 2020; Tax Map #55.-2-24-6.1 & 6.2 entitled Gateway Summit Senior Housing – Lot 6 Re-Approval of Amended Final Site Plan. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

THE FAIRWAYS SENIOR HOUSING – LOT 7 – GATEWAY DRIVE – TM- 55.-2-24.8-1, 8-2 – EXTENSION OF FINAL AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the Engineering Department has no objection to re-granting the Site Plan approval for this project as there are no changes to the site being made. The following should be noted:

Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH) Requirements

- The PCDOH approved the wastewater collection system plans and they are valid until October 12, 2022.

New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Requirements

- The NYCDEP approved the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for this project on August 21, 2007.
- The NYCDEP provided a conditional extension to the August 21, 2007 SWPPP on October 29, 2012.
- The conditions of the SWPPP are now set to expire on August 22, 2022.
- The NYCDEP approved an extension of the design approval on May 13, 2010. The permit is set to expire on November 7, 2024.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Requirements

- The NYSDEC wetlands permit is set to expire on September 9, 2025.
- The NYSDEC granted a stormwater permit on June 18, 2007. According to the NYSDEC website, this permit is still in effect.
- The NYSDEC updated the General Stormwater Permit in 2020 (GP-0-20-001)
- Per the NYSDEC if a project was approved under an earlier version of the General Stormwater permit and is being built under an updated version of a General Stormwater permit, the applicant does not need to meet the updated technical criteria, only ministerial criteria.

Mr. Cleary had no objection to the re-approval.

Ms. Dawn McKenzie of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this application is also for 150 senior housing units, similar to the Gateway project. There are 96 units in the multi-family buildings, 24 townhouse units and 30 cottages. She said this is also part of the G & F subdivision which comes off of Route 6. She said there is a trail system that brings people down the hill to the lake. A dock and boathouse has been approved by the NYSDEC. She stated there 418 parking spaces provided. There are 276 spaces indoors and 142 spaces outdoors spread throughout the site.

Mr. Cote moved to adopt Resolution #20-12, dated November 12, 2020; Tax Map #55.-2-24-8.1 & 8.2 entitled The Fairways Senior Housing – Lot 7 Re-Approval of Amended Final Site Plan. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kugler with all in favor.

THE HAMLET AT CARMEL – STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 66.-2-58 – EXTENSION OF FINAL AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the applicant is requesting a re-approval of the previously approved site plan. The Engineering Department does not have any objection to re-approval of the site plan application for this project as there are no changes to the site being made. The Engineering Department previously met with applicant on October 5, 2015. The following should be noted:

- The re-approval request is for the previously Planning Board approved site, any site changes which may be contemplated by the applicant may trigger a new site review process and regulatory review.
- The performance bond and engineering inspection fee will need to be increased to reflect current costs.
- Stormwater maintenance agreement and bond will be required.
- The Out of District (OOD) Water and Sewer agreements will need to be updated to reflect the proposed use. The applicant is in the process of amending the existing OOD water and sewer agreements. The amendment will result in a reduction from the previously approved flow of 72,000 gpd (for water and sewer) to 42,000 gpd of flow (for water and sewer). The Engineering Department performed a flow assessment and the reduction is acceptable.

The applicant has the following approvals:

New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Requirements

- The NYCDEP approved the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for this project on March 23, 2010.
- The NYCDEP permit has been renewed and will expire on March 23, 2025.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Requirements

- The project received coverage under the NYSDEC the General Stormwater Permit on April 2, 2010. (Permit Number NYR10S384)

Town of Carmel

- OOD Water and Sewer Agreements dated July 9, 2002.

Mr. Cleary had no objection to the extension.

Ms. Dawn McKenzie of Insite Engineering, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated this project has 120 senior housing units on Stoneleigh Avenue. There are 48

units in multi-family buildings and the rest of the units are attached single family cottages. There is over 38,000 square feet of recreation provided on the site of the required 36,000 square feet of recreation.

Mr. Cote inquired if there is enough of a market to warrant these three big senior housing projects.

Mr. Cleary stated these uses require a marketing study to be submitted to justify the projects. That was done for each of these projects. At some point in time, do we revisit that, if circumstances have changed?

At which time, a discussion ensued regarding the senior housing communities and the need for them and if traffic studies were conducted at the time of their approvals.

Mr. Cleary stated all the projects had very detailed traffic studies done.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to grant extension of site plan approval for 1 year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

MINUTES – 09/16/20 & 10/21/20

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Giannico moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cote with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta